



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/064,882	08/27/2002	Fuh-Cheng Jong	7837-US-PA	6187

31561 7590 08/26/2003

JIANQ CHYUN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OFFICE
7 FLOOR-1, NO. 100
ROOSEVELT ROAD, SECTION 2
TAIPEI, 100
TAIWAN

EXAMINER

PIZARRO CRESPO, MARCOS D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2814

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/064,882

Applicant(s)

JONG ET AL.

Examiner

Marcos D. Pizarro-Crespo

Art Unit

2814

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 June 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 June 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

Application/Control Number: 10/064,882 (Final Rejection)
Art Unit: 2814

Page 2

Attorney's Docket Number: 7857-US-PA

Filing Date: 8/27/2002

Claimed Foreign Priority Date: -- none --

Applicant(s): Jong et al.

Examiner: Marcos D. Pizarro-Crespo

DETAILED ACTION

This Office action responds to the amendment in paper no. 3 filed on 6/10/2003.

Acknowledgment

1. The amendment in paper no. 3, filed on 6/10/2003, in response to the Office action in paper no. 2, mailed on 2/11/2003, has been entered. The present Office action is made with all the suggested amendments being fully considered. Accordingly, pending in this Office action are claims 12-15.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description (see, e.g., [par0026]/II.2): **112**".

3. A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim R jections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishi (US 5760454) in view of Takiyama (US 5559351).

7. Regarding claim 12, Nishi shows (see, e.g., fig. 6) most aspects of the instant invention including a memory cell structure formed on a substrate, the structure comprising:

- one source region **2** formed inside the substrate
- one drain region **3** formed inside the substrate
- one gate structure **1** formed on the substrate between the source **2** and drain **3** regions

Art Unit: 2814

wherein:

-
- the gate structure 1 includes a gate oxide and a control gate layer sequentially stacked on the substrate (see, e.g., col.1/ll.6-10)
 - the gate structure 1 has a waist portion wider than two ends thereof respectively adjacent to the source region 2 and the drain region 3

Nishi, however, fails to specify the material of the gate oxide. Takiyama (see, e.g., col.13/ll.40-42), on the other hand, teaches that Nishi's gate oxide may be an oxide-nitride-oxide (ONO) layer.

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to have an oxide-nitride-oxide layer as Nishi's gate oxide, as taught by Takiyama, since ONO layers are commonly known in the semiconductor art for their use as gate oxides.

8. Regarding claim 13, Nishi shows that the waist portion is roughly at a symmetrical line that runs across the central region of the gate structure 1 between the source 2 and the drain 3 regions (see, e.g., fig. 6).

9. Regarding claim 14 and in reference to the claim language referring to the function of the gate structure, intended use and other types of functional language must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish between them. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In the instant case, there is no apparent structural difference between the prior art and the claimed invention as a result of using

Art Unit: 2814

the gate structure as an equivalent source region. *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

10. Regarding claim 15, Nishi shows that the gate structure 1 is roughly a hexagonal shape with two sides adjacent to the source 2 and the drain 3 regions (see, e.g., fig. 6).

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 12-15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


13. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2814

14. Papers related to this application may be submitted directly to Art Unit 2814 by ~~facsimile transmission~~. Papers should be faxed to Art Unit 2814 via the Art Unit 2814 Fax Center located in Crystal Plaza 4, room 3C23. The faxing of such papers must conform to the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (15 November 1989). The Art Unit 2814 Fax Center number is **(703) 308-7722** or **-7724**. The Art Unit 2814 Fax Center is to be used only for papers related to Art Unit 2814 applications.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Marcos D. Pizarro-Crespo** at **(703) 308-6558** and between the hours of 9:30 AM to 8:00 PM (Eastern Standard Time) Monday through Thursday or by e-mail via Marcos.Pizarro@uspto.gov. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wael Fahmy, can be reached on (703) 308-4918.

16. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the **Group 2800 Receptionist** at **(703) 308-0956**.



SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2000

Art Unit: 2814

17. The following list is the Examiner's field of search for the present Office Action:

Field of Search	Date
U.S. Class / Subclass(es): 257 /202,295,298,314,317,324-326,401,E29.309 (H01L29/792); 438 /216,261,287,591-593	8/21/2003
Other Documentation: PLUS Analysis	1/29/2003
Electronic Database(s): EAST (USPAT, EPO, JPO, PGPub)	8/21/2003

Marcos D. Pizarro-Crespo

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2814

703-308-6558

marcos.pizarro@uspto.gov